



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,405	01/29/2004	Santosh Shanbhag	112-0136US	2871
29855 7590 07/25/2008 WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070				
			EXAMINER WON, MICHAEL YOUNG	
			ART UNIT 2155	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/767,405

**Applicant(s)**

SHANBHAG ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHAEL Y. WON

**Art Unit**

2155

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MICHAEL Y. WON.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Keith Lutsch (Reg. No. 31,851).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 July 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 28 and 61.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stai et al. (US 6,401,128).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: With respect to the limitations of claims 28 and 61, Mr. Lutsch expressed the differences in the architecture of the invention and the reference. Such distinction was evident in Fig. 4 of the drawings as compared to Fig. 1 of the reference. The examiner agreed that Stai did not teach the design/architectural limitations of claims 28 and 61, however, expressed that further searching will need to be performed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michael Won/  
Primary Examiner  
July 23, 2008

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required